## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FI	L	E	D
11 114	4 (	20	112

	JOH 1 0 2010
JEFFREY S. WHEELER,	Clark, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Plaintiff,	Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia
v.	) Civil Action No. 18-1420 (UNA)
COMCAST, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, his *pro se* civil complaint and motion for a temporary restraining order. The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even *pro se* litigants, however, must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

As drafted, the complaint utterly fails to comply with Rule 8(a). It is barely legible, and does not appear to articulate a cognizable legal claim. The Court will grant plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, dismiss the complaint and this civil action without prejudice, and deny the motion for a temporary restraining order as moot. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 6/15/16

United States District Judge